

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

WAYNE HOWARD EASLEY,	:	
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	NO. 1:11-CV-00064
v.	:	
	:	
COMMISSIONER OF	:	
SOCIAL SECURITY,	:	
	:	
Defendant.	:	

This matter is before the Court on the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation (doc. 17), Plaintiff's objections thereto (doc. 20), and the Commissioner's response to Plaintiff's objections (doc. 21).¹ In her Report and Recommendation, the Magistrate Judge recommends that the decision of the Administrative Law Judge ("ALJ") denying Plaintiff's applications for disability insurance benefits and supplemental security income be affirmed and this case be dismissed from the Court's docket.

In brief, Plaintiff filed applications for supplemental security income ("SSI") and disability insurance benefits ("DIB") in January 2008, alleging a disability onset of August 7, 2006, resulting from Osgood Schlatter's disease and a back injury (doc.

¹ The Court notes that Plaintiff filed a "Reply" to Defendant's response to Plaintiff's objections to the Magistrate Judge's report (doc. 22). Such a reply is not specifically permitted under Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72, but, in any event, it does not change the Court's decision here.

17). The ALJ determined that Plaintiff had degenerative disc disease of the lumbar spine; arthritis in both knees; a history of Osgood Schlatter's disease; depression; and anxiety (Id.). However, the ALJ further determined that Plaintiff was not disabled under the Social Security Act and that he had a residual functional capacity ("RFC") of light work with certain limitations (Id.).

Plaintiff presented two assignments of error to the Court: (1) that the ALJ erred in determining that Plaintiff had an RFC of light work and (2) that the ALJ erred in discounting Plaintiff's testimony (Id.). The Magistrate Judge rejected both of these assignments of error, determining that the ALJ had not erred either in his assessment of Plaintiff's RFC or in his assessment of Plaintiff's credibility because each of these decisions was supported by substantial evidence (Id.).

Plaintiff objects to the Magistrate Judge's Report & Recommendation, largely reiterating the arguments set forth in his assignment of errors (doc. 20).

As required by 29 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b), the Court has reviewed the comprehensive findings of the Magistrate Judge and considered de novo all of the filings in this matter. Upon thorough consideration of the foregoing, the Court finds Plaintiff's objections unpersuasive and determines that the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is thorough, well-reasoned and correct. Consequently, the Court

ADOPTS and AFFIRMS it in its entirety. Accordingly, the decision of the Commissioner is AFFIRMED and this matter is closed from the Court's docket.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: March 16, 2012

/s/ S. Arthur Spiegel
S. Arthur Spiegel
United States Senior District Judge